

Illinois Library

TOWN MEETING



December 25, 1955
Vol. 21, No. 35
902nd Broadcast

"THOUGHTS ON CHRISTMAS DAY"

Speakers:

NORMAN COUSINS
CHARLES G. BOLTE

With Statements by:

FIELD MARSHAL VISCOUNT MONTGOMERY
HAROLD MacMILLAN
JOYCE CARY
DR. ROGER BANNISTER
JOYCE GRENFELL
SIR NORMAN ANGELL

Moderator:

DR. SHEPHERD L. WITMAN



Presented in cooperation with
British Information Services
and the BBC

BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

Broadcast Sundays, ABC Network, 8 to 9 p.m., Eastern Time

"THOUGHTS ON CHRISTMAS DAY"

ANNOUNCER: TOWN MEETING comes to you this Christmas night from the ABC Studios in New York. This particular program has been arranged in cooperation with one of the two organizations in America which project news and views of Great Britain to the people of the United States via radio, television and films. This is the British Information Services, an agency of the British Government. The other organization, the British Broadcasting Corporation, is an independent body which, through its New York Office, makes available to American radio stations a wealth of material ranging from current events to full length plays and concerts. The British Information Services have built up a large following through "Window on the World," a series of recorded talks by prominent British leaders in all fields -- a series pioneered by Seymour Siegel, director of New York's Municipal Station, WNYC, and now expanded to other stations. Tonight's TOWN MEETING is, in effect, a "Window on the World" of opinion on our problems and hopes at the end of another year.

Now, to preside as moderator of our discussion, here is Dr. Shepherd L. Witman, Director of Residential Seminars on World Affairs. Dr. Witman!

DR. WITMAN: On this Christmas night, we want to share some thoughts with you wherever you may be -- in your homes, in cities, in villages and on the farm or in your car on your way from what we hope were your happiest holidays. Wherever you are, whoever you are, something which will be said in this hour will strike a responsive chord in you. For we shall talk of many things tonight so let me tell you what we are going to do on this TOWN MEETING. Seated beside me at this Christmas night fireside visit are Norman Cousins, Editor of the "Saturday Review," and Charles G. Bolte, Executive Secretary of the American Book Publishers Council, who will reflect and comment upon messages which have been recorded for you by Field Marshal Viscount Montgomery; The Right Hon. Harold Macmillan, Britain's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs; Novelist Joyce Cary; Roger Bannister, comedienne Joyce Grenfell and Sir Norman Angell, the distinguished British political scientist. As I said before, we shall talk about many things.

Let us begin by hearing from a man whose picture in his jaunty battle cap is familiar to all Americans. With a lifetime of military service to the British Empire, Field Marshal Viscount Montgomery is well-remembered for his leadership of allied armies in World War II. He presently serves as Deputy Supreme Allied Commander in Europe. Speaking now to TOWN MEETING, Field Marshal Viscount Montgomery!

FIELD MARSHAL VISCOUNT MONTGOMERY: I am full of hope -- full of hope for the future of the free world so long as we are united and strong. And given united strength and unselfish solidarity, we cannot lose in this contest -- we can't lose. But if we drift apart we will disappear, one by one.

What did one of your great American poets write -- he wrote this: "All your strength is in your union. All your danger is in discord." That was Longfellow and no truer words were ever written. That is the factor of unity.

I want to speak to you about leadership, and I want to put to you the situation as seen by me, an international soldier and the servant of fourteen governments, one of which is the government of this country. The leadership of the free world lies in the hands of your great country. You have not always been in this position -- not always. For many years the British nation supplied world leadership, and they have been dealing with world problems for centuries. Your nation has only the experience of decades. But today, the leadership is yours, and it has been yours since 1945. How have you exercised that leadership in the past, and how will you exercise it in the future?

How have you exercised that leadership in the past? You did very well in the immediate post-war years. If it hadn't been for the United States of America and the attitude you adopted in strengthening the free world, first economically and then militarily, I firmly believe we might have been involved in a third world war -- I

The "Town Meeting Bulletin" is published weekly by The Town Hall, Inc. The text is compiled from a recording of the actual broadcast and the publisher is not responsible for the statements of the speakers. Subscription rates: \$5.00 per year; six months, \$3.00. Single copies, 25¢. Quantity rates on request. Address: "Town Meeting Bulletin," New York 36, New York.

firmlly believe it. Your generosity and your leadership saved us from that catastrophe, and today -- today we find the nations of the West well on the way to regaining their former well-being. But in consequence of that, they are becoming more independent. Fear of war -- of hot war -- fear of hot war has receded into the background. Sovereignty and national pride are regaining their pre-war positions. The nations are not so easy to handle today as they were formerly. They can still be led but they can't be coerced, and some nations cannot now be influenced by dollars -- some. And the present is, in fact, in my view, a most difficult time. I often think the next five years are going to prove more difficult than the last five. And when one sits down and ponders about it, I see possible changes in the nature of the Western alliance.

The nations of the free world who are now recovering their economic stability may begin to think that they can do without your strong right arm beside them and your support behind them. They may begin to think that. They cannot possibly do so -- not possibly. And no more can you do without them, however strong you may be -- you can't -- and you want to get that absolutely clear: you can't. If the alliance begins to crumble, that is the end for us all. Now American help and leadership, given in the recent past and indeed at the present time, have been most helpful in settling some of the difficult problems around the world; and they give promise of American steadfastness in meeting those problems yet to come.

What then, we must now ask ourselves, what then is the action we must take to deal with the present trouble between the Communist world and the free nations? What is the long-term remedy we must seek? It is this: It is in calmness and confidence to meet strength with strength, will with will, and faith with faith. That's what we must do.

Now in these circumstances is, what is called peaceful co-existence possible? Is it, or is it not? Is peaceful co-existence possible in these circumstances?

Well, I think it is. But the term must be rightly understood. That is the important point -- what you mean by it. If peace means simply the absence of major war, then peaceful co-existence in our time is not only possible, but it is probable provided, and only provided, that the free nations maintain their strength and unity, and the leadership of the United States is convincing and is exercised with understanding. And that proviso is very important -- provided we maintain our strength and unity, and provided your leadership is convincing and is exercised with understanding. But if peace is something more than the mere absence of total war, if peace is understood to mean a positive state of harmony and concord, then I consider that peaceful co-existence is not to be hoped for.

Now let us look at what Lenin said. What did he say? I will read you what Lenin said. He said this: "The permanent co-existence of the Soviet Republic and the imperialistic states is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end. And before that end arrives a series of terrible collisions between the Soviet republic and the bourgeois nations is inevitable." That's what he said. We are faced, therefore, with the prospect of a peaceful co-existence which means the absence of both peace and war in the full sense of those words. And it may last for years, perhaps even for generations. I heard it well described recently as "co-existence with conflict." We must expect that the Communist powers will continue to use every means short of world war to penetrate, to disrupt and to dominate the other half of the world, probing the weak spots and calling off the offensive in any particular place only if strong and effective resistance is offered.

Now, my friends, this is a grievous prospect, but it is not so grievous as total war, and it is not so grievous as surrender -- certainly not. It is a prospect which calls for vigilance, for steadfastness and the unremitting maintenance of unity and collective military strength; and, above all, it calls for a continuation of American leadership. And you must understand that history will measure your success by the quality of that leadership.

DR. WITMAN: As I told you before, we have two gentlemen in the studio tonight who will share their thinking with you as they, too, listen to our friends from abroad. One of them is Mr. Charles J. Bolte, who is Executive Secretary of the American Book

Publishers Council. Mr. Bolte joined the King's Royal Rifle Corps in Britain before Pearl Harbor, serving with them until he was wounded in the African campaign. He then returned to the United States to work with the Office of War Information. He helped organize the American Veterans Committee and from 1947 to 1949 studied as a Rhodes Scholar in England. His forthcoming book, "A Price Tag for Peace: A Plan for Disarmament" will be published in March.

His colleague this evening is Mr. Norman Cousins, our old friend and editor of the well-known journal of ideas, the "Saturday Review." He has just returned from his fourth observation tour around the world. Now honorary president of the United World Federalists, he has worked with this group for a number of years in its program for a stronger United Nations. His latest book, "Who Speaks for Man," develops the argument for world law.

Gentlemen, what do you have to say about the remarks of Field Marshal Montgomery?

MR. COUSINS: It is tremendously heartening to see a man of the military background of Viscount Montgomery define responsibilities of leadership in our time and places just as much emphasis on non-military approaches to the problem of peace as on military approaches. He also makes it clear that the free peoples of the world are looking to the United States for specific leadership. I believe it our responsibility to define exactly what kind of leadership in the present crisis may be effective. My own feeling -- I don't know whether Mr. Bolte shares this -- is that leadership today means leadership of the human race. I say "leadership of the human race" because it is not enough today merely to speak for the nations of the Western hemisphere and of Europe. It becomes necessary now for the United States to define leadership in a way that can attract the preponderance of the world's peoples and this clearly means the kind of leadership that can enable us to keep the majority of the peoples of Asia and Africa on the side of freedom.

DR. WITMAN: Thank you, Mr. Cousins. How about you, Mr. Bolte?

MR. BOLTE: Well, I was quite touched by that very handsome tribute to American leadership which my old commander made. I was in Montgomery's army in the desert and it's very nice to be associated with him again on more peaceful occasions. I wonder a little bit, and I think probably it's what Mr. Cousins was suggesting in his remarks, I wonder whether we really deserve quite that handsome a tribute without doing some more than we are now doing -- particularly, I should think, we need not only as Marshal Montgomery suggested to match strength with strength and will with will, but also ideas with ideas. The production of ideas is one thing that needs a lot of encouragement at the moment. Wouldn't you agree, Norman?

MR. COUSINS: I certainly agree with that. I think that not until the United States comes up with a great unifying idea in the world will we have true security. I don't think our security rests on military strength alone. I believe that we must be strong militarily. I think it would be fatal to give up our military strength but, at the same time, it would be fatal to suppose that military strength by itself can give the American people the security they need today. Therefore, I join with you, Mr. Bolte, in believing that the United States today has the responsibility for seeing the world whole and for recognizing the importance of the great unifying idea. If this is what Viscount Montgomery meant when he said that unity is necessary, then I would certainly agree.

MR. BOLTE: Well, I think one can take some good cheer and have additional hope for peace in the reflection that so many of the leading soldiers like Marshal Montgomery are turning more and more against war, knowing about the new weapons and realizing it just would be fatal to use them.

MR. COUSINS: On the other hand, I think it would be equally true that some military men, recognizing the power from weapons, feel that our only security rests in dropping -- or striking the first blow ourselves. Fortunately, this is a rather small number, but it is important for us, it seems to me, Mr. Bolte, to bear in mind that it seems unreasonable to suppose that our security can rest on mutual terror. There are some people today who feel that this is all that is now necessary. I don't, for a minute, believe that the existence of this absolute weapon in both camps by itself

is sufficient grounds for security. I think we have to go beyond that.

DR. WITMAN: Thank you for those comments on Viscount Montgomery's statement, gentlemen.

One of the great figures in British letters, Sir Norman Angell, is celebrating his 81st birthday tonight. He is a former journalist and member of Parliament. The author of 41 books, Sir Norman was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for his work titled "The Grand Illusion." And now, let's hear from Sir Norman Angell!

SIR NORMAN ANGELL: It has been my great good fortune to pass twenty years of my life in the United States, and I have very vivid memories of those years. But I am talking to you at the moment from my home in England. Certain features of the history of the last ten years, it seems to me, have been marked by an extraordinary contrast, the meaning and causes of which still escape us.

On the one side we have this vast expansion of the Russian Communist Empire represented by the virtual annexation of ten European nations and the domination of China with its five or six hundred million population. More significant still, perhaps, is the fact that the Russian Communist Empire possesses missionaries, agents, outposts, fifth-columns in the shape of Communist Parties, big or little, in every country of the world -- notably in the great Democracies of France and Italy. Never before in history has an empire shown so rapid and so immense an expansion.

On the other side we have the contrasting decline and contraction of the British Empire and British power: withdrawal from India, from Pakistan, from Burma, from Ceylon, the Sudan, Palestine, Iraq, the Suez Canal Zone, Egypt; with exhausting and obstinate revolts in Malaya, Kenya, Cyprus, unrest in several African territories. Britain does not possess the kind of support which Russia finds in Communist parties the world over; indeed, most nations -- including in the past the United States -- have possessed large parties strongly resenting British imperial power as an evil force in human affairs.

And surely, we should do well to revise in the light of events and facts some over-simplified condemnations of British imperialism. Imperial authority may at times be preferable to the only available alternative, such as complete anarchy or complete defenselessness. If there had been no British Empire after the fall of France in 1940, no Gibraltar, no Malta, no troops in Egypt to defend the Suez Canal and resist the armies of Rommel, no volunteer Indian Army of two million men to resist the Japanese forces coming down through Burma, then I suggest that it is evident that Britain would have had to follow France into surrender, and Hitler would have conquered Europe and Japan have conquered India, and to put it at its very lowest, the subsequent situation of the United States would have been precarious.

While it is true that Britain could not have won the war by herself, she could have lost it by herself and made the task of defense for the United States immensely more difficult. In a letter to President Monroe dated, "Monticello, October 24, 1823," Jefferson, the chief author of the Declaration of Independence, wrote these words: "Our endeavor should surely be to make our hemisphere that of freedom. One nation most of all could disturb us in this pursuit. She now offers to lead, aid and accompany us in it. Great Britain is the nation which can do us the most harm of any or all on earth; with her on our side we need not fear the whole world. With her then, we should most sedulously cherish a cordial friendship." These are words worth recalling when the Britain of tomorrow may have become the center of an integrated Commonwealth that encircles the globe.

DR. WITMAN: Mr. Bolte, what do you think about Sir Norman's statement?

MR. BOLTE: I love the quote from Jefferson -- especially that last phrase, "most sedulously cherish a cordial friendship." That's very good, and I think we should certainly do that. I assume we will continue to do so. I don't know we have to agree with Sir Norman about imperialism to sedulously cherish our cordial friendship and I recall something that Gandhi used to say to the British when they talked along the lines about law and order, etc., -- Gandhi said, well, after all, you taught us ourselves that good government is no substitute for self-government. And I think most of the people in the world today -- the ones in Africa and Asia -- who are coming

out of an imperialist past would feel that that was still true for them and no matter what the good points of imperialism may be represented as having been, they've had it and they're going on to govern themselves.

MR. COUSINS: As you comment, Mr. Bolte, I think of a conversation I had in 1951 with a newspaper editor in Madras who startled me by saying that he was putting his bets down on communism to win in Asia. He said, as you know, I run an anti-Communist newspaper but, he said, I'm not sure that the United States is going to really help me run this newspaper as I would like to see it run in defeating Communism. He said that's why a lot of people are putting their bets down on Communism to win out here, for three reasons. First, he said, the American people don't know enough about the situation out here in Asia to come up with an intelligent policy. Second, he said, you don't realize that what the people want out here is not merely tractors and shovels -- what they want out here is some sense of moral leadership. They're looking for a champion and Russia is going to be able, very cheaply, to pose as the champion of the peoples of Asia by posing as the champion of Asian freedom, -- so that when Sir Norman refers to imperialism, I think that we must also make it clear that if communism has advanced in Asia, it has been able to advance in the kind of vacuum which we might do well to study. Now, there is a third point in connection with, as I remember it, the statement of this editor in Madras, which is that we in the United States are disposed to underestimate the resourcefulness of the Russian leaders and their people, -- that we've spoken a great deal about atomic secrecy and, he said, whether you realize it or not, without any help from you the Russian is going to be able to make some pretty big explosives of his own. He also pointed out it was probable they were going to develop engineers of their own and I say, in listening to Sir Norman, I think back on this conversation and hope that the people of the United States right now will recognize that the time has come to know Asia and know Africa.

DR. WITMAN: Yes, and one of the things perhaps that Sir Norman emphasizes is the importance of our working together with the British in the achievement of this, don't you think so?

MR. BOLTE: Which I think we are actually doing.

DR. WITMAN: Another one of our friends is Mr. Joyce Cary, who is one of Britain's most important novelists. For ten years he wrote and then destroyed book after book, but eventually submitted his work for publication and was immediately recognized as a writer of great significance. As I said before, we are talking of many things tonight. As a result of his authorship of "Except The Lord," a political trilogy, Mr. Cary has been accused of mistrusting politicians. Now here is his answer. Mr. Joyce Cary!

MR. CARY: People are accusing me of saying in a novel that I have just written that politicians have to be crooks, especially politicians in a democracy. Now I am very glad of the chance in this broadcast to deny this because actually it is just the opposite that I believe.

What I think is that it's especially in a democracy that a politician ought to be known for an honest man. He ought to be an honest man because its just in a democracy that he has to persuade us to trust him. If he were a Fascist, or a Communist, he would simply give orders and say, "You jolly well do what I tell you or I'll shoot you." But in a democracy he has to persuade us -- he has to persuade us to give him his support and our votes.

What is right and what is wrong in politics? Well, we see to start with, we see that politicians are just like advocates counsel in court -- lawyers. They each of them try to persuade us by making a case, just like a counsel of court when they are defending or prosecuting a prisoner they try to persuade the jury by making up a case for the prosecution or the defense. And we know the rules -- we see them in practice every day. Counsel are allowed to arrange the facts, to play down some of the evidence that is against them and make a good deal of anything that is useful to them and they try to discredit the witnesses on the other side and, of course, they give as much credit as possible to witnesses on their own side. They must not tell lies but they can make the strongest possible argument for one lot of facts and run

down the other lot of facts and all this is held to be quite legitimate; it is quite legitimate because we have found, after a lot of experience, that in the real world that it is the best way of getting at the truth. The truth is somewhere between.

Now, roughly speaking, what I suggest is that this, which is right in the courts is right in politics so far as argument and persuasion go, that is to say, in an election. And it is, for the same reason -- the citizen may get at the truth between the two sides. But this applies only to the time for election. It applies only to persuasion. When your politicians win the election and get power the position gets different at once.

Now that means that we have to trust our statesmen and our ambassadors to do their honest best for our good. They may have to keep secrets from us and therefore we have to trust them. We don't know what they are doing. And it is just because, even in a democracy, that we can't always know what our statesmen are up to and why, that we have got to be able to trust them and why it is so important for statesmen to keep the name of honest men.

DR. WITMAN: He stresses the parallel between courts and politics insofar as arguments of persuasion go. Do you think this is a valid analogy for him to draw?

MR. BOLTE: Well, I do. I was struck by that. I like that line about using one set of facts to run down the other set of facts. I don't think you expect, or should expect a politician to get up and spend half his speech talking about good the other party is and then they really get a lot of swell ideas. Obviously the two major parties in this country do agree about most of the fundamentals in American life and government. They disagree on other points and each one in making a speech would try to make the strongest possible case for his own side. I think that's quite an illuminating analogy really to the law courts.

MR. COUSINS: I think that possibly Mr. Cary's term "politics" takes in a lot of ground. I wasn't too sure, as he spoke, whether when he referred to politicians he was thinking primarily of ward heelers and parasites, or whether he was referring to men in political office. Taking in as much territory as it does, I'm afraid that I'll have to stand on the sidelines on this. I do believe, however, that the great hope for this country is that we can get more people into politics. The great hope is that young people everywhere will become interested in the engineering of human consent, engineering of political consent and will recognize that the political system of America is no stronger than the people who go into it.

DR. WITMAN: Another thing Mr. Cary said which struck me is something which would certainly find a response in American minds -- his stress upon the importance of having secrets in politics. We don't like that in this country, do we?

MR. BOLTE: No, I didn't like that at all. I disagree with that point. I think -- well, obviously, you maybe have to have classified material on armaments and you don't go around printing the blueprints for the latest weapons, but I can't really see any matters of policy on which you need secrets. I'm prepared to trust politicians who demonstrate that they deserve the trust but I think the people in government especially ought to talk more to the people while they are formulating policy and not just give them the finished package at the end and say take it or leave it.

MR. COUSINS: I think when Mr. Cary was referring to the need to keep secrets he probably had more in mind the statesman than he did the domestic politician and I think it goes without saying that there comes a time when it becomes necessary to prepare an issue somewhat out of the public gaze.

DR. WITMAN: This opens up still another area of the whole field of international politics.

MR. COUSINS: That's right. That's why I say I was a little uncertain as to exactly what he had in mind.

DR. WITMAN: I rather think he was referring to the domestic political scene.

MR. COUSINS: All secrets are off, as far as I am concerned, in domestic politics.

DR. WITMAN: One of the great achievements in the world of sport in our time was the running of the four-minute mile by Roger Bannister. Last December he announced his retirement from competitive running to devote himself entirely to his career as a

purely political to other fields so as to find the solution for these vital problems. I commend you to your labors.

MR. DALY: As in a period of ten years before -- when America watched with anxiety the developments on the continent of Europe -- our eyes shifted now to the Far East. At this half-century mark, an island in the Pacific was claiming page one headlines. Formosa was a controversial hot spot. California's Senator William F. Knowland summarized his stand on Formosan defense.

SEN. KNOWLAND: Because a free China existing on the Island of Formosa is important to the ultimate freedom of all China, because the conquest of Formosa by communism would have a disastrous psychological effect throughout Asia and the world, and because Formosa in the unfriendly hands of international communism would jeopardize our strategic defense position in the Far East and place our defenses in this age of the airplane and the atomic weapon back on the Pacific coast, I believe that it is essential that communism be checked in Formosa. By so doing, we may save not only Asia, but the whole free world.

MR. DALY: Senator Knowland would speak no less strongly tonight. Now, we were again at war -- in Korea. These were the months of the Great Debate. Two other United States Senators, sharing the Town Meeting rostrum in May, 1951, discussed our Far East policies and fifteen months later, these same two men were to become rival candidates for the Vice Presidency. First, Senator Richard M. Nixon.

SFN. NIXON: There has been too much talk of the relative merits of MacArthur and Truman, of the differences between Democrats and Republicans, of the possible conflicts between the policy of the United States and the other United Nations, and not enough emphasis on the real problem. General MacArthur was fired because he suggested steps which he said could and should be taken to bring military victory on the battlefield. But Secretary Acheson and the Administration, in opposing the steps General MacArthur recommends, have consistently failed to offer any alternative program of their own.

MR. DALY: With another view: Senator John Sparkman:

SEN. SPARKMAN: First, let me answer the question that was proposed in the beginning, "Why did the President fire General MacArthur?" Now, the President did not fire General MacArthur because he suggested a plan. The reason General MacArthur was fired was this: Under our setup, we have a Joint Chiefs of Staff whose job it is to plan strategy and to plan our military operations. Our Joint Chiefs of Staff did make their plans, and General MacArthur was not willing to fall in line with those plans and those orders that were given to him by our Joint Chiefs of Staff. And that is the reason the President felt that there was no other alternative except to relieve General MacArthur from his command.

MR. DALY: The war in Korea dragged on and finally was ended. No more stirring moment occurred in all of Town Meeting's twenty years than the night in 1953 when South Korea's Ambassador, Dr. You Chan Yang, expressed his own hopes -- and fears.

DR. YANG: When your forefathers were facing against all odds -- against that great, most powerful country in the world that was England -- did they ever draw back? Did they say, we cannot face them and fight them? They loved liberty and freedom and the decency of life. So they fought and they won -- and our people want to fight until their country is reunited so that they can live too as free men and free women and enjoy the dignity of man.

MR. DALY: Thomas E. Dewey, appearing on Town Meeting shortly after his return from the Far East in 1952, summarized his impressions with these words.

MR. DEWEY: You can't keep a free world if you only keep pieces of it. The great crisis in this world is whether it's going to be strong enough so that the Soviet Union can be stopped from getting a good bite per annum. I want most desperately, for the sake of keeping this country alive and free -- which is the most important thing in the world -- to avoid World War III by having enough strength on our side so that it won't happen, because dictators don't usually start wars they expect to lose, and I want to be so strong that Stalin or his successor will not start a war he can lose. One of the ways is to keep that 300 million people on our side.

MR. DALY: War and threats of war across the Pacific -- and, at home -- legislation for social welfare! In the thirties, we called it the New Deal. In the forties, it was known as the Welfare State. An eloquent spokesman for the Democratic administrations of Roosevelt and Truman, former Interior Secretary Oscar L. Chapman stated the case for his party.

MR. CHAPMAN: The complexity of modern society and the growing dependency of the individual upon society has necessarily increased the need to promote the general welfare and to secure the blessings of liberty. During the last 16 years, the Federal Government has attempted to meet that need. Through the Wagner Labor Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, we have attempted to secure the worker against the exploitation of employers, and through the Social Security Act, we have attempted to secure our people against temporary unemployment and insecurity in old age. Through housing legislation, we have attempted to provide low-income families with decent housing. And through numerous other measures we have attempted to assure for the majority of the people a fair share in the economic output and wealth of this nation.

MR. DALY: A staunch defender of the free enterprise system, the late Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio disagreed with Mr. Chapman.

SEN. TAFT: If we permit the government -- particularly the Federal Government -- to take over all welfare services, furnish them free to all the people of this country, we will destroy the personal liberty of those people. If we adopt a national system by which, at a huge cost, the government attempts to give free medical service to all the people; if we adopt a system in which they give free housing to practically all the people, then that will defeat our own purpose and will limit the people's ability to spend the money which they earn by the sweat of their brow -- because the government will insist that you give all of your money, finally, to the government and permit the government to decide what services and what things you shall get for your money.

MR. DALY: With the increasing threat of Communism abroad, real concern developed here at home over possible infiltration -- and with it, a name came across the American political horizon which was to provoke one of the great controversies in our history. In April, 1947, on the stage of the Civic Opera House in Chicago, Town Meeting debated the question: "Should the Communist Party Be Outlawed?" One of the speakers was a newly-elected Senator from Wisconsin.

SEN. McCARTHY: I realize full well that merely outlawing the Communist Party and wiping the name "Communist" from the ballot is but one of the many actions to be taken. The Department of Justice should rule that the Communist Party is an agency of a foreign power and subject to the Voorhis Act and the Logan Act which laws concern themselves with conspiracy against the nation and action on the part of foreign agents. The FBI should be empowered and directed to publish the names of all the Communist front organizations.

MR. DALY: Senator McCarthy was answered by Georgia's former Governor Ellis Arnall.

GOV. ARNALL: I desire to point out to the Senator that the fundamental criticism of all totalitarian governments, whether communistic or fascistic, follow a pattern which brings about the destruction of civil liberties and freedom. I would not want us to adopt Hitlerism in this country as a substitute for Jefferson's Bill of Rights. We cannot preserve freedom by wiping out the civil liberties of our people.

MR. DALY: The junior Senator from Wisconsin agreed with Governor Arnall on the dangers of name-calling.

SEN. McCARTHY: I think a tremendous amount of damage has been done by calling a lot of good, serious liberal 'Communists.' The word "Communism" is such a libelous phrase that I believe it should be reserved only to those who should receive that type of defamation.

MR. DALY: That was in 1947. Three years prior to the Wisconsin Senator's now-famous Wheeling speech, seven years prior to the Army-McCarthy hearings which were debated on a Town Meeting when Attorney Godfrey P. Schmidt had this to say:

America probably came from England and the jokes probably came from here. We may be slow to get a joke, though I must say I don't seem to find it, but I think on the whole we have a pretty good sense of humor. The Cockneys certainly do; they're very sharp and quick. There's a great link, I think, between taxi drivers here and taxi drivers in London. They have the same sharp sense of humor.

I'm suddenly reminded, out of the blue, of a remark made by a bus conductor once to my father. It was in the month of June, which is when the Royal Ascot Race Meeting takes place, and it's very, very, very smart. You know, Ascot is the chic thing to go to, and this bus conductor suddenly sang out, as they do in London; you know they say where they've got to -- they call out and say "Sloan Square," "Picadilly Circus," wherever it is -- and this one suddenly said, "Hyde 'Park' Corner," and he turned to my father and he said, "I always talk like that in Ascot Week; it gives a flavor of the Royal enclosure."

Well, as it's Christmas, of course, one begins to think about Christmasy kind of things. But I can't think of anything very specially Christmasy to say to you, but I do think of it in accents, which is the thing I rather specialize in -- I love accents. Whether you say, "I hope you have a bonnie Christmas" -- that's not very good but it's meant to be Scotch -- or "I 'ope you have a very smashing Christmas and much love to you and the kiddies" -- which is a Cockney sound -- or whether you say "I hope you-all are goin' have a very happy time," -- or "It's been a very lovely season and I hope you have all had a very happy Christmas as we have here in the Middle West," but, however you say it, or if you say it in my favorite -- I always think of it as Philadelphia via Long Island via New York, and with rather a wealthy background, the voice that says, "It really has been the most divine Christmas, and I really can't wait for the next one, can you?" Whether you say that, or whether you just say, "Happy Christmas," it all comes to the same thing, and we say it in English, by the way. Let's remember that! I mean, that's the language we all speak and that's where we have to meet. Wasn't it Bernard Shaw who said it was a great disadvantage that we spoke the same language, that if we had a different language we'd probably understand each other better? I don't entirely agree with that. I think we understand each other pretty well, and it's very important that we should because we stand for something very basic, very high-principled and, after all, the law that we abide by is the law which makes the wheels go around, and let's all stick to it, and a very happy Christmas and New Year too!

DR. WITMAN: That was delightful, wasn't it? Norman Cousins, would you like to comment?

MR. COUSINS: Unless I am greatly mistaken, it was also Bernard Shaw who said that the American and the British are two wonderful people separated by the same language. About three years ago, in London, I was asked by a professor to give him an example of American humor and I resisted the request because I was afraid that I would be pushed into the kind of joke that would be feeble even in the United States. Finally he said, "Well now, you must give us an example," and I said, "All right, there was a Kentucky mountaineer who was walking down the street and he happened to see a stranger. He went up to him and said 'Howdy, stranger.' The stranger said, 'Howdy.' He said, 'Stranger, I want you to know that you're welcome here.' 'Yes, thank you,' said the stranger.' 'And because you're welcome here,' said the mountaineer, 'I'm going to give you a drink,' whereupon the mountaineer took a jug off his shoulder and handed it to the stranger who said, 'Sorry, I don't think I want it.' 'Listen stranger, when I tell you you're welcome here, you're welcome here -- now you drink.' And the mountaineer took a gun and levelled it at the stranger. The stranger took one swig, his eyes rolled out on his cheeks and the mountaineer said, 'Well, now, tell me the truth, what did you think of that?' And the stranger said, 'Well, if you really want to know, I think it was terrible.' 'Ain't it the truth,' said the mountaineer, 'now you hold the gun on me while I take a drink.'" Well, I told this joke and the people present looked around and finally the professor said to me, he said, "Was the drink really that bad?" So there is really no explaining it. I have a hunch, to come

back to the earlier question, that what we want to do is to have a world in which it is possible for people to laugh at their own jokes. It's not going to be necessary to have universal laughter.

MR. BOLTE: I certainly did laugh at Joyce Grenfell, but I share your view -- I've heard an awful lot of English comedians who I don't laugh at very much. She was charming, especially that wonderful Philadelphia accent -- it really has been the most divine Christmas. Well, I hope you all have a bonnie Christmas -- that's the way I feel.

DR. WITMAN: Actually, the stress which she placed on the common language which we speak can be a very important and useful bond, can it not?

MR. COUSINS: It can lead to a common understanding.

DR. WITMAN: I don't think we should end this discussion of her fine report to us on the basis of an assumption that it's going to separate us because we speak the same language. Actually, we're going to stick together, I am sure.

America feels a warm kinship towards England's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, The Right Honorable Harold Macmillan. His mother was born in the United States -- as he will tell us in a moment. Mr. Macmillan, whose membership in Parliament dates back to 1924, has held many high positions in his government. When Sir Anthony Eden became Prime Minister, he assumed the duties of Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. TOWN MEETING is honored to present this message from The Rt. Hon. Harold Macmillan.

HON. HAROLD MACMILLAN: I am very glad of this chance to address a great audience of American listeners. In a way I think I've got a certain right to do so because, although I am a member of a British Cabinet, I am half American. My mother was born many years ago in one of the border states and a great deal has changed in America since those days. She came from a little town called Spencer, in Indiana. Since her birth, of course, the huge development of the United States, the great Western drive, the development of the Middle West -- all that has happened. But I have often heard her talk of the old days, of her Uncle Erasmus, of all the old folk at home, and from my earliest childhood, although I have paid many visits to America since, it has been what mother told me about them that has stayed in my mind.

We are seeing the reverse process now because wherever we go in our little island, we see your American boys -- some of them in the Air Force stationed along the east coast of England -- some of them around some of our ancient cities with their old cathedrals and the Old World look. Some of them are in Scotland and some of them in the south. We've got, altogether, with your soldiers and your airmen, quite a big settlement, I would almost call it, of American boys living a year or two years, or whatever their service calls upon them to do, among our people. But I want to tell you -- because I expect you worry about them sometimes -- that we are very happy to have them. I hope we can make them happy. They are doing, of course, a tremendous job. They are part of the great protective screen under which the New World lives and under which the Old World is protected partly by the help of the New World.

Well now, we are coming to the beginning of another year. We've just had Christmas and all that Christmas means to the free peoples, to the Christian peoples. It means quite a lot, doesn't it? It means an awful lot in our homes, and as we get older and our children and grandchildren -- and I've got nine grandchildren with me at Christmas time -- we begin to think, I think, more about our childhood. I can't help thinking what a difference it was when I was a child. There wasn't any communism then. The world had a lot of trouble, but it wasn't divided by this kind of thing. And the story of Christmas and the lesson of Christmas was one which covered almost the whole civilized world. Well now, I suppose, we are back again in something like the Dark Ages. We can't just take the Christmas story and what it means for granted, we've got to fight for it. It isn't something we just get. It's something we've got to win. And now we are going to enter on a new year. I think we ought to enter on it in this spirit -- with great hope because we are going to win in the end, you know.

We must win if it's right; the great hope, great accomplishments and the absolute certainty that we can do it under Providence if we stick together.

Now there are quite a lot of people trying to make the free countries quarrel. There are quite a lot of people trying to make America suspicious of Britain -- and trying to make Britain jealous of America. But they aren't the people, you know, who are on the side of the angels. They are all the people who want the evil things to happen. And just be a little suspicious when you hear that kind of talk. It's probably inspired not by the man who speaks it, or even the man who gave it to him, but somewhere far back it's inspired by the people who want us to quarrel. The only people who want us to quarrel are the people who want the evil things for the world.

DR. WITMAN: With these words by The Right Honorable Harold Macmillan, we come to the end of those thoughts on Christmas night which we have been considering, and we thank you, Norman Cousins, Editor of the "Saturday Review," and you, Charles G. Bolte, Executive Secretary of the American Book Publishers Council, for joining us to comment on the statements we have heard from our friends across the sea. Thanks also to the British Information Services for helping us to arrange this discussion.

FAMOUS DEBATES ON "TOWN MEETING" RECORD ALBUM!

Wendell Willkie vs. Robert H. Jackson on "Government and Business."

Harold Ickes vs. Gen. Hugh S. Johnson on "The New Deal."

Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy vs. Ellis Arnall on "Outlawing the Communists."

Al Capp and John Mason Brown on "What's Wrong with the Comics?"

Dean Acheson and Verne Marshall on "Intervention in Europe."

These are just a few of the memorable excerpts from

the "Town Meeting: A 20-Year Cavalcade" record album

by HERITAGE. John Daly, Narrator.

For further details, write to:

"TOWN MEETING"

New York 36, N. Y.